

Application No. 09/173,858

### REMARKS

Applicants again express their appreciation for the attention devoted to reviewing this application and for the suggested amendment, which has been adopted. It is anticipated that this will overcome the section 101 rejection.

Applicants believe that this amendment to the preamble and not to the elements of the claim merely restates the proper interpretation of the claim, in light of the specification. Accordingly, this is not a narrowing amendment. It provides additional context in which those of skill in the art will understand the limitations of the claim that follow the preamble.


Applicants also hope that the further discussion of claim 1 and the general subject area of these claims will persuade the Examiner to withdraw the section 112 rejection of claim, as it should now be clear that it is not necessary to define in claim 61 any particular steps of a commercial transaction that are carried out between receipt of an input document and generation of an output document. Claim 61 defines a method that is applicable to a wide variety of commercial, electronic commerce transactions and is not limited by the nature of the commercial transaction. Therefore, section 112 does not require any limitations based on the particular nature of a commercial transaction that benefits from this invention.

### CONCLUSION

Applicants hope that the case is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has further questions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned, who regularly can be reached between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 5:30 p.m., PST, excepting lunch hour, at 650-712-0340.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2 May 2003

  
Ernest J. Beffel, Jr., Reg. No. 43,489

HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP  
P.O. Box 366  
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019  
(650) 712-0340 - telephone  
(650) 712-0263 - facsimile